

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*BCS*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/178,887 10/27/98 SUGAHARA Y 018656-048

021839 WM31/0523
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

TRAN, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED:

8
05/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/178,887	SUGAHARA, YOSHINORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas Q. Tran	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 & 6. 20) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (US Patent No. 5,982,994) in view of Okazawa (US Patent No. 5,937,148).

As to claim 1, Mori teaches;

a printer server (i.e., SVR in fig. 55);

at least one printer (i.e., PRT in fig. 55) connected to the print server;

a plurality of computers (152s in fig. 55) connected to the print server;

each of the computers (fig. 21) includes a status monitor (i.e., GUI 31a in fig. 21) for displaying the status of the printer (41 in fig. 23) connected to the print server.

However, Mori does not explicitly teach the print server includes a job observation stationary module for monitoring the status of the printer connected to the print server;

Okazawa teaches the print server includes a acquiring module for monitoring the status of the printer connected to the print server (col. 12, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to have modified the system of Mori for monitoring by acquiring module the status of the printer connected to print server as taught by Okazawa. The suggestion of modifying the print system of Mori can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by acquiring module of Okazawa for checking the status of the printer and

informing this status to the clients. For this reason, the clients of the system of Mori easily monitor and control their print jobs.

As to claim 2, Mori teaches a plurality of printers connected to the print server (col. 3, lines 11-14).

As to claim 3, Okazawa teaches means for a user of one of the plurality of computers to designate a particular one of the plurality of printers for a particular print job (S35 in fig. 6).

As to claims 4 and 5, Mori teaches means for a user of one of the plurality of computers to postpone a particular print job (45b in fig. 23).

As to claims 11-14, the combination of Mori and Okazawa the methods are performed by the apparatus claims 1-4 as indicated above.

3. Claims 6 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. and Okazawa as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Hisatake (US Patent No. 5,669,040).

As to claim 6, the combination of Mori and Okazawa teaches the features in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Okazawa teaches the status monitor of each of the plurality of computers includes means for displaying an operating condition (fig. 7, step of 26 in fig. 5 and from step of S36 in fig. 6).

However, the combination of Mori and Okazawa does not teach a waiting time for the printer which is displayed in the status monitor.

Hisatake teaches a waiting time for the printer which is displayed in the status monitor (U32 and U16 in fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to have modified the display means of Mori and Okazawa for displaying a waiting time as taught by Hisatake. The suggestion of modifying the system of Mori and Okazawa can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Hisatake because Hisatake provides more status options displayed in the window including the waiting time. Such modification would allow the system of Mori and Okazawa to control the time of the new print jobs to the available printer.

As to claims 15-16, the combination of Mori, Okazawa and Hisatake teaches the method is performed by the apparatus claim 6.

4. Claims 7-9 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. and Okazawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (US Patent No. 6,213,652).

As to claims 7-9, the combination of Mori and Okazawa teaches the features in claim 1 above.

However, the combination of Mori and Okazawa does not teach the computers and the print server exchange registration request and response.

Suzuki teaches the computers and the print server exchange registration request and response (col. 9, lines 29-60).

It would have been obvious to have modified the system of Mori and Okazawa for exchanging the registration signal between the hosts and the print server as taught by Suzuki. The suggestion of modifying the system of Mori and Okazawa can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Suzuki because Suzuki provides the password option

which allow the clients to check their print job status. This above feature would modify the system of Mori and Okazawa in order to increase the security of their system.

As to claims 17-19, the combination of Mori, Okazawa and Suzuki teaches the methods are performed by the apparatus claims 7-9 as indicated above.

5. Claims 10 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al. and Okazawa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Hamazaki (JPO Patent No. JP409212313A).

As to claim 10, the combination of Mori and Okazawa teaches the feature in claim 1 above.

However, the combination of Mori and Okazawa does not teach the print server includes means for calculating a waiting time for availability of the printer.

Hamazaki teaches the print server includes means (i.e., a print time estimation part 109 calculates the estimated time of every print job) for calculating a waiting time for availability of the printer (See Solution).

It would have been obvious to have modified the print server of Mori and Okazawa for including calculator calculates the waiting time of print jobs in a server as taught by Hamazaki. The suggestion of modifying the system of Mori and Okazawa can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Hamazaki because Hamazaki provides that a print time estimation part for calculates the estimated time of every waiting print job. Such modification would allow the system of Mori and Okazawa to control the time of the new print jobs to the available printer.

As to claims 20-21, the combination of Mori, Okazawa and Hamazaki teaches the methods are performed by the apparatus claim 10 as indicated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or e-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
May. 19, 2001



JOSEPH A. MANCUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER